

**REMARKS**

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 9, 2005 and further to a telephone conference conducted on June 3, 2005. By the present Amendment, claims 55-62 have been canceled and new claims 63-68 have been added. Claims 1-54 were previously canceled by preliminary amendment. It is respectfully submitted that the aforementioned claims are fully supported by the specification, introduce no new subject matter, and are patentable over the prior art. Prompt and favorable consideration of the claims as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 55-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,695,502 to Pier et al. By the present amendment, the Applicants have canceled claims 55-57 and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the Office Action be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claim 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,612,933 to Brinkerhoff. By the present amendment, the Applicants have canceled claim 59 and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the Office Action be withdrawn.

The Office Action stated that claims 60-62 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By the present amendment, the Applicants have rewritten claim 60 as new claim 63 and includes all of the limitations of canceled base claim 59. It is respectfully submitted that new claim 63 is in condition for allowance. In addition, new claims 64-68 depend directly or indirectly from new claim 63. It is

Appl. No. 10/751,579  
Amdt. dated June 6, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 9, 2005

respectfully submitted these claims are also in condition for allowance.

During the telephone conference, claims 63-68 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,695,854 to Kayan et al. In response thereto, Applicants hereby submit a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c) and the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d). It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-17 has been overcome.

Please charge the fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20 (d) to Deposit Account **21-0550**.

**TWO (2) COPIES OF THIS SHEET ARE ENCLOSED.**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the application, namely claims 63-68, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner desire a telephonic interview to resolve any outstanding matters, he is sincerely invited to contact the undersigned at (631) 501-5713.

Respectfully submitted,



Dana A. Brussel  
Reg. No. 45,717  
Attorney for Applicants

Carter, DeLuca, Farrell & Schmidt, LLP  
445 Broad Hollow Road - Suite 225  
Melville, New York 11747  
Tel.: (631) 501-5713  
Fax: (631) 501-3526

**Send correspondence to:**  
Chief Patent Counsel  
Tyco Healthcare Group  
150 Glover Avenue  
Norwalk, CT 06856